

## **REMARKS**

The undersigned attorney for applicants thanks Examiner Castellano for the helpful in-person interview held on May 23. A Request for Continued Examination is being concurrently submitted so that the amended claims can be considered by the Examiner.

In the April 5, 2001 final office action, the Examiner allowed claims 1 and 2; rejected claims 3-14 and 16-17 under 325 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by USP 3,696,962 to Fehres et al. ("Fehres"), and rejected claims 5-7 under 325 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by USP 4,177,934 to Hammes et al. ("Hammes").

To expedite prosecution, claims 1-17, as amended, and new claims 18-19 are being submitted for the Examiner's consideration.

### **Changes to the Specification**

The language added to the disclosure at page 15 is supported by Fig. 6 of the present application and also claim 25, as originally filed, of parent application number 09/363,107, now U.S. Patent No. 6,116,453. The contents of parent application number 09/363,107 were expressly incorporated by reference into the present application, as indicated on the cover sheet PTO/SB/29 submitted with the present application.

### **Rejection of Claims 3-14, 16-17 under 35 USC 102(b) over Fehres**

Independent claim 3, as previously presented, recited the improvement of "an exterior rib . . . having both an upper surface and a lower surface projecting radially outwardly of said first and second portions".

Independent claim 4, as previously presented, recited the improvement of "an exterior rib . . . having both an upper surface and a lower surface projecting radially outwardly beyond said first and second portions".

This feature can be clearly seen in the marked-up copy of original Fig. 6 of the present application, attached as Ex. A.

In formulating the rejection of independent claims 3, 4, 5 and 10, the Examiner took that position that Fehres disclosed "an exterior rib (as denoted in yellow), the rib defining part

of the barrel edge and having both an upper surface and a lower surface projecting radially outwardly of the first and second portions.” (04/05/01 office action, p. 2, ¶ 3).

Applicants disagree with this characterization of Fehres. The Fehres reference clearly does not meet the recited limitation that the rib extends “radially outwardly of the first and second portions.” However, to expedite prosecution of the present application, applicants have changed independent claims 3 and 4 to specify that the rib extends “extends radially outwardly beyond an outward extent of (the) first and second portions”, language suggested by the Examiner during the interview. Independent claims 5 and 10 have similarly been amended to recite that the ‘rib’ extends “outwardly beyond an outward extent of said first and second chime walls.”

Because Fehres does not disclose a rib extending outwardly of the first and second portions (or chime walls), it is submitted that independent claims 3, 4, 5 and 10 define over Fehres.

#### **Rejection of claims 5-7 under 35 USC 102(b) over Hammes**

Claims 5 and 10, as previously presented, recite a chime portion having, inter alia, a first chime wall, a “substantially cylindrical second chime wall directed upwardly from an *outer* portion of said first chime wall”, (emphasis added) and an exterior rib.

In formulating the rejection of claim 5, the Examiner provided a marked-up copy of Hammes’ Fig. 1, indicating the Examiner’s interpretations of the first chime wall, second chime wall and exterior. The Examiner then argued, with reference to his marked-up copy, that Hammes discloses “a substantially cylindrical second chime wall (as denoted in blue) directed upwardly from an outer portion contiguous with the first chime wall”.

Applicant submits that the Examiner’s interpretation of Hammes, as shown in the Examiner-marked-up copy of Hammes’ Fig. 1, is improper. The Examiner appears to have arbitrarily drawn boundaries in this figure in a manner contrary to the present application. In accordance with Fig. 6 of the present application and related disclosure, the second chime wall is defined as the section of the chime portion that is above an uppermost portion of the rib. It is submitted that Hammes does not disclose a “substantially cylindrical second chime wall directed upwardly from an *outer* portion of said first chime wall”. Instead, Hammes discloses a wall that is directed upwardly from the innermost portion of the barrel wall. To

expedite prosecution of the present application, however, independent claims 5 and 10 have been amended to recite the dual limitations of:

- (1) a substantially cylindrical second chime wall directed upwardly from an outer portion of said first chime wall . . .
- (2) ... with the second chime wall being defined as that section of the chime portion that is above an uppermost portion of the rib.

It is submitted that Hammes, even as interpreted by the Examiner, clearly does not disclose a second chime wall having these dual characteristics.

#### **New Claims 18 and 19**

New claims 18 and 19 are substantially similar to amended claims 3 and 4, respectively, except that new claims 18 and 19 recite "a first portion (27) attached to said body (20)" instead of "a first portion (27) extending radially away from said body (20)"


With regard to all claims under rejection that are not specifically mentioned, it is submitted that these are patentable not only by virtue of their dependence on their respective base claims and any intervening claims, but also for the totality of features recited therein.

Reconsideration of the application is requested. Claims 1-17 are believed to be in allowable form and define over the prior art. An early notice of allowance is requested so that the application may proceed to issue. Applicants reserve the right to file a Continuation application submitting previously presented claims.

No fee is believed to be due for this submission. Should a fee be required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any such fee to Pennie & Edmonds LLP's Deposit Account No 16-1150.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 26, 2001

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marcia H. Sundeen  
**PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP**  
1667 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-4400

Reg. No. 30,893




FIG. 6

Ex. A - marked-up copy of  
Fig. 6 of  
present application  
(09/525,002)